Remarks

Thorough examination by the Examiner is noted and appreciated.

The claims have been amended to clarify Applicants disclosed and claimed invention. The amendments find support in the original claims and/or the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The claims have been amended to overcome Examiners objections.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

The claims have been amended to overcome Examiners rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

1. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-17 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyr (US 6,223,055), and further in view of Speasl et al. (US 5,815,114) and Wilson et

al. (US 6,317,089).

Cyr discloses a wireless office architecture having a private branch exchange (PBX) with a wired extension, and a wireless base station couplable to the PBX. The wireless base station and the PBX cooperate to manage a wireless terminal associated with the wireless bases station and the wired extension (associated with the PBX) as a unified extension. (see Abstract; Figure 1, items 130 and 140).

Thus, Cyr discloses that the PBX is in communication with (couplable with) the wireless base station by a communications connection between the PBX and the wireless base station (within the in-building communication system (see col 2, line 67 to col 3, line 7; and Figure 1). The **communication connection to the public switched telephone network (PTSN)** (see items 101 and 102; Figure 1) from the in-building communication system **is only via the wireless base station (not the PBX)**. (see col 3, lines 3-7; Figure 1).

Thus, Cyr does not disclose several aspects of Applicants disclosed and claimed invention.

Cyr does not disclose or suggest "A business telecommunication system capable of connecting wireless mobile stations and wired stations located at a plant to avoid wireless signal communication degradation".

Cyr does not disclose or suggest "at least **two dedicated lines**, at least one line of said at least two dedicated lines **connecting said base station with a public switched telephone network, another at least one line of said at least two dedicated lines connecting said public switched telephone network with said private branch exchange**".

Rather as previously noted Cyr discloses that **only the wireless base station** is connected to the **public switched telephone network** (PSTN).

Cyr doc not disclose or suggest that both the wireless base station and the PBX are connected with or in communication with the PSTN. The communications system of Cyr therefore operates by a different principal of operation than the communication system of Applicants disclosed and claimed invention.

Cyr also does not disclose the function of Applicants system

"whereby a communication signal multipath can be eliminated, and reliable communication can be attained in circumstances of shielded areas causing communication signal reflections at the plant."

Moreover, Cyr does not recognize or suggest a solution to the problem that Applicants have recognized and solved:

"A business telecommunication system capable of connecting wireless mobile stations and wired stations located at a plant to avoid wireless signal communication degradation within signal reflecting areas".

Rather the system of Cyr (only wireless base in wireless communication with PSTN) would present a system susceptible the very problems that the system of Applicants is intended to overcome.

Speasl et al. on the other hand disclose a global positioning system (GPS) positioning system for locating objects

in places where GPS signals do not penetrate.

Examiner postulates that it would be obvious to place a base station within a shielded environment to improve signal communications, and cites Speasl et al. to support his assertion.

Firstly, Applicants do not claim what Examiner asserts. Secondly, the fact that Speasl et al. discloses a system for using a GPS system to precisely locate an object or a person using a GPS system in an interior internal spaces or shielded environments (see col 2, lines 17-21) is of little relevance to Applicants disclosed an claimed invention.

Applicants do not claim or disclose using a GPS system. Speasl et al. do not disclose or claims a communication system or a wireless base station, or any other element of Applicants disclosed and claimed invention.

Moreover, the fact that shielded environments can cause signal degradation is known and has been outlined by Applicants specifically with respect to communications and multipath fading in Applicants discussion of the prior art and the problems presented thereby. For example, see paragraph 007 of Applicants

disclosure:

"A specific manifestation of multipath fading called Raley fading arises from the ensemble of reflected signals arriving at the receiver antenna and creating standing waves. From the transmitting antenna, even a tightly focused radio signal scatters, or spreads out. The ground and bodies of water reflect the signal back upward, and the atmosphere reflects the signal downward. At the receiver, portions of the signal arrive at different times, as the signal has taken multiple paths of differing path lengths from transmitter to receiver. Occasionally, the aggregate signal from the indirect paths can be of similar strength to the signal from the direct path. If the two signals are of opposite phase, a standing wave is created, and the signal fades in overall strength. The ultimate impact is that of increased transmission errors. The radio signal processing in both the base station and mobile units have to be designed to tolerate a certain level of multipath fading. One of the examples where poor quality of telecommunications especially matters and is specifically sensitive is when processing tools and equipment are not placed in the clean room area yet, and low telecommunication efficiency slows down the tool move. By and large, it reduces flexibility customarily provided by mobile

telecommunication."

Even assuming *arguendo* that Speasl et al. is analogous art, there is no apparent motivation for combining the teachings of Speasl et al. and Cyr, which disclose systems that work by different principles of operation.

Nevertheless, even further assuming *arguendo*, a proper motivation for combining the teachings of Speasl et al. and Cyr, such combination does not produce Applicants disclosed and claimed invention or recognize or suggest a solution to the problem that Applicants have recognized and solved by their disclosed and claimed invention.

On the other hand Wilson discloses an apparatus for transferring energy between a transceiver in a shielded environment to an antenna in an unshielded environment (see Abstract; col 1, lines 44-52). Thus Wilson discloses and apparatus and method that works by a different principle of operation than both the methods of both Cyr and Speasl et al.

However, even assuming *arguendo* that Wilson is *analogous* art and there is a legitimate *motive* to combine the teachings of

Wilson with either Cyr or Speasl et al., which Applicants do not concede, such combination does produce Applicants disclosed and claimed invention and therefore does not further help Examiner in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

"Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure." *In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).*

"The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of appellant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." *Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Mfg. Co., 223 USPQ 351, 353 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984).*

"If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious." *In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810, 123, USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).*

Since the cited references, singly or in combination, fail to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Applicants independent claims neither has a *prima facie* case been made out with respect to Applicants dependent claims.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims are now in condition for allowance. Such favorable action by the Examiner at an early date is respectfully solicited.

In the event that the present invention as claimed is not in a condition for allowance for any other reasons, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative at his Bloomfield Hills, Michigan office at (248) 540-4040 such that necessary action may be taken to place the application in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Tung & Associates

Randy W. Tung
Reg. No. 31,311
Telephone: (248) 540-4040